

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 7.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 3 as being anticipated by Chaperot, EP 0831032. Regarding claim 1, the Examiner states that Chaperot discloses a ream wrap (Figures 1-3) comprising a paper poly coated composite (1) having transparent, solid plastic film windows (3, 4, 9, 10). The ream wrap of Chaperot allows for the viewing of the top of the paper contained and multiple sheets of paper.

Amended claim 1 requires that the windows allow for viewing of the face of the paper. The face of the paper is the part of the paper that is written on by the user. This is shown in figures 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the present invention. The Examiner states that Chaperot teaches that the viewing of the side of the paper can be the top if the side is placed on top. If for example, one takes a glass, the top of the glass is where the water is poured in, no matter which direction the glass is facing. In any case, Chaperot does not teach a window in a ream wrap that shows the face of the paper. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated nor obvious over Chaperot.

Chaperot teaches a window constituted by an opening, 3 and 4, previously cut out in the wrapping and covered with a transparent material. The window is made in the portion of the packaging extending over two sections.

As stated in the prior art section of Chaperot, Chaperot teaches against having an inspection window on top of the wrapper, showing the face of the

paper, stating that the usefulness of the prior art observation window is significantly reduced away to being covered by the aforementioned wrapper.

Chaperot teaches a projecting window, i.e., formed at one of the edges of the mill wrapper, not a window that shows the face of the paper being wrapped.

The inspection window of Chaperot is a transparent window, i.e., constituted of an opening that was previously cut into the wrapper and covered with a transparent material, preferably film. The window is arranged in the portion of the wrapper that extends over an edge of the wrapper, preferably over the two edges on both sides of a joining edge of the two edges. The window described by Chaperot can only show the multiple sheets of the paper, and not the face of the paper as claimed in amended claim 1.

Chaperot does not teach placing a window on top of the ream wrap showing the face of the paper which is wrapped, and in fact teaches away from this. When a ream wrap is placed on a shelf, many times the side of the shelf has brackets which cover the sides of the ream wrap, and therefore, the window on the side of the ream wrap can not assist the buyer. Further, a window on the side of the ream wrap can not show the buyer what the texture of the paper is like, while the window on the top of the ream wrap can show both the color and texture of the wrapped paper. By providing a window which shows both the sides of the paper and the face of the paper, a user can determine both the color of the paper and the texture of the paper without opening the ream wrap.

Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated nor obvious over Chaperot.

As to claim 3, the Examiner states that Chaperot discloses windows cut into the top and side of the ream wrap.

Claim 3 requires that the windows are cut into the top of the ream wrap and at least one side of the ream wrap. This allows a user to see the face of the paper. This is done to better assist the buyer in discovering the type and color of the paper the user is buying without unwrapping the ream wrap. For the reasons stated above for claim 1, claim 3 is not anticipated nor obvious over Chaperot.

The Examiner has rejected claims 7 as being obvious over Chaperot.

The Examiner states that Chaperot discloses the claimed invention except for the plurality of holes on the top of the ream wrap. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to provide a second hole on the opposite end of the top side (see Figure 2) in order to enhance the number of display orientations available. Such a duplication would have been a mere duplication of parts.

Amended Claim 7 requires that the paper have holes cut out on top of the ream wrap and on at least one side of the ream wrap, allowing viewing of the face of the paper contained in the ream wrap and viewing of multiple sheets of paper contained in the ream wrap. Chaperot does not teach this feature nor makes it obvious. Chaperot only teaches a window which allows viewing of the side of the paper, and not the face of the paper. Therefore claim 7 is not obvious over Chaperot.

The Examiner has rejected claims 6, 8 and 10 as being obvious over Chaperot in view of Gatewood (US 2002/0050119 A1).

Regarding claims 8 and 10, the Examiner states that Chaperot, as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, discloses the claimed invention except for the film covering the entire paper material.

The Examiner states that Gatewood discloses a clear film laminated to a paper backing in order to increase the strength of the wrap (see for example paragraphs [0030] and [0034]). The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to have made the film of Chaperot to cover the entire paper material as taught by Gatewood in order to increase the strength of the wrap.

Claim 10 depends on claim 1 and requires that the film cover the entire paper material. The inspection window of Chaperot is a transparent window, i.e., constituted of an opening that was previously cut into the wrapper and covered with a transparent material, preferably film. Chaperot does not each nor describe a film that covers the entire paper material. In fact, Chaperot does not discuss using the film with the paper, only to cover the window. Although Gatewood describes a laminated paper stock made of at least one biaxially oriented polymeric film, an adhesive and a paper substrate, it does not discuss having windows allowing the viewing the paper. There is no reason to combine the references. Chaperot teaches putting a film at an opening that was previously cut into the paper, where Gatewood teaches using a film adhered to a paper, having no openings. For these reasons and the reasons stated above for claim 1, claim 10 is not obvious over Chaperot in view of Gatewood.

As to claim 8, the Examiner states that the wrap of Chaperot-Gatewood discloses the claimed basis weight, Gatewood para [0029].

Claim 8 depends on amended claim 7. For the reasons stated above for claim 7, claim 8 is not obvious over Chaperot in view of Gatewood.

As to claim 6, the Examiner states that the wrap of Chaperot-Gatewood discloses the claimed method by presentation.

Claim 6 requires that the film be adhered or laminated to the entire paper, the paper having holes cut into it.

Chaperot teaches that the film covers the open space only. The use of the film on the entire paper increases the strength of the ream wrap, which is not taught by Chaperot since Chaperot does not teach the combination of paper and film. There is nothing in Chaperot nor Gatewood to suggest combining the references. Therefore claim 6 is not obvious over Chaperot in view of Gatewood.


Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance.

"EXPRESS MAIL" Mailing Label No. EV 309317350 US
Date of Deposit: May 3, 2004
I hereby certify that this paper (and any document(s) attached herewith
is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail
Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the
date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner
for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on
May 3, 2004

Signature:

Name: Debbie Broderick

Respectfully submitted,


Philip M. Weiss
Reg. No. 34,751
Attorney for Applicant
Weiss & Weiss
310 Old Country Rd., Ste. 201
Garden City, NY 11530
(516) 739-1500